



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Studies in the Old Persian Inscriptions.\**—By ROLAND G. KENT,  
Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

§ 1. The extreme care with which monumental inscriptions are cut should be a constant warning to their interpreters not to take liberties with the established text, once that text has been carefully read and verified; and now that Rawlinson's work on the great inscription of Darius on the Rock at Behistan has been verified, or corrected, as the case may be, by Jackson and by King and Thompson, scholars should beware of emending for the sake of getting a more easily explainable text. Where any alteration in the recorded reading is attempted, it should be along the accepted lines of textual criticism, which are coming more and more to regard errors as due to mechanical imperfection, rather than as due to the operation of the human mind. Any emendation of the Old Persian inscriptions should therefore be based on such processes as dittography, haplography, accidental omission of one or more of the strokes forming the character, partial obliteration of signs by the action of the elements, and the like. From this conservative standpoint, some passages in the Behistan inscription are here examined.

§ 2. For convenience, an index, according to sections, of the main words and topics discussed, is here presented:

SCRIPT:

Analogical Writing 59 ftn.  
Compounds, final vowel of  
prior element 7—14  
Conventional Writing 3 ftn.,  
13 ftn.  
Dittography 45  
Enclitics, vowels preceding 7  
—14  
*H* antevocalic 24—27  
Haplography 44, 45  
Vowels, final 3 ftn., 7—14

PHONOLOGY:

Dissimilation 27  
Haplogly 5 ftn., 46  
Riming Groups 13 ftn.

MORPHOLOGY:

Augment, irregular 29—31  
Declension,  
acc. plur. 34 ftn.  
locative 5  
pronominal  
nom. sing. 55 ftn.  
acc. sing. 55 ftn.

---

\* This article was in type in the fall of 1915. See page 319.

- fem. sing. 4  
 masc. and neut. sing. 36  
 and ftn.
- SYNTAX:  
 Anacoluthon 38  
 Case Usage  
   with verbs *jan-* 62, 63  
                   *tarsa-* 40, 41  
                   *dāraya-* 57 ftn.  
                   *parsa-* 66, 67  
   acc. with *dauštā biyā* 59  
   gen. part. as obj. 56 ftn.  
   loc. of specif. 5 ftn.  
   with *hacā* 35—42, 44
- Pronouns  
 antecedents 54—63  
 enclisis 58 ftn.
- SPECIAL WORDS:  
*aniya-* 55 ftn.  
*aniyanā* 36 and ftn.  
*āpariyāya* 21—32  
*avahyarādiy* 3—6, 14  
*asa-, aspa-* 50, 51  
*imam imām* 55 ftn.  
*iy* 59 ftn.  
*iyam* 55 ftn.  
*ufrasta- ufrašta-* 66, 67 and  
   ftn.  
*ufrastādiy* 64—69  
*uṣabārim* 47—51  
*xšapa-* 13 ftn.
- jan-* 62, 63  
*taumā* 15—20  
*tarsa-* 40, 41  
*tya-* 3 ftn., 36 ftn.  
*tyanā* 45  
*ṭakata<sup>m</sup> ṭakatā* 67 ftn.  
*darśam* 33, 34, 40—44  
*diš* 57  
*drauga-* 42—44  
*nāma nāmā* 5 ftn., 38  
*māhyā* 5 ftn., 26 and ftn., 27  
*yanaiy* 36 ftn.  
*rauta* 37, 38  
*šām* 56  
*šim* 52—55, 55 ftn., 60, 62, 63  
*hacā* 35—42, 44  
*hya* 3 ftn., 36 ftn.  
*hyāparam* 36 ftn.
- PASSAGES:  
 Bh. 1, 23: 21—32  
   1, 50: 33, 34, 40—44  
   1, 62: 55  
   1, 86—87: 47—51  
   1, 96: 55 and ftn.  
   4, 6: 52—63  
   4, 33—36: 58 and ftn.  
   4, 67—69: 59, 64—69  
   5, 15—16: 56 ftn.  
   5, 26—27: 55 and ftn.  
 Dar. NRa 36—37: 56 and ftn.  
 Suez c 8—10: 37, 38

### I. Avahyarādiy.

§ 3. *Avahyarādiy* 'on this account' occurs Bh. 1, 51—52; 4, 47; a 9—10; and in mutilated form 1, 6—7; 4, 54. 62. Inasmuch as *avahyā*<sup>1</sup> (wherein the length of the final vowel<sup>2</sup> is graphic merely, not phonetic) is the regular gen. masc. and neut. of the pronominal stem *ava-*, there would seem to be no reason for departing from the old view that the word is a compound

<sup>1</sup> Occurring Bh. 1, 29; 3, 70; 4, 48—49.

<sup>2</sup> Foy's disquisition, *KZ.* 35, 2—12, on the rationale of the OPers. script does not convince me; I feel strongly that this script has been conventionalized in certain points, such as *-ā* for final short *-a*, *iy* and *uv* for final and postconsonantal *i* and *u*, and the combinations *hi* and *hu* (see § 24); observe the stem *tya-* for *\*tiya-* by the influence of the writing *hya-* (not *\*hiya-*).

equal to the Greek phrase *τοῦτου ἕνεκα*, both in form<sup>1</sup> and in meaning, and to the Latin *huius rei causā*.<sup>2</sup> It is therefore a little surprising to find that Bartholomae<sup>3</sup> interprets the word as *\*avahyā rādiy*, where the prior member is a loc. fem. sing. in agreement with the noun which is the second element. It is, he says, an early compound which kept the old form of the pronoun, for which as an independent word *\*avahyāyā* came into use later. Both the earlier *\*avahyā* and the later *\*avahyāyā* are based upon the extension of the *-hy-* element,<sup>4</sup> seen in the Skt. pronominal forms *tasyāi tasyās tasyām* &c.

§ 4. This *-hy-* element, on the testimony of the pronouns in Skt. and in Av., is found in the gen., dat., abl. and loc. cases of the fem. sing.<sup>5</sup> Of such forms we actually have, in OPers., only the genitives *ahyāyā* (written also *ahiyāyā*) and *hamahyāyā*, and the locative *ahyāyā*. In the gen., corresponding to the Skt. *asyās*, we have an OPers. *\*ahyā<sup>h</sup>*, which would be written *ah<sup>2</sup>y<sup>a</sup>a*, identical with the masc. neut. *ahyā* = Skt. *asya*; for in OPers. absolutely final short *a* is written with the separate letter, not expressed merely by the vowel inherent in the preceding consonant. For distinction perhaps, or even merely for assonance to the nominal *-ā-* stems in the same case, fem. *ahyā* was made over to *ahyāyā* (cf. subst. gen. *taumāyā*); the process is the same with *hamahyāyā*. But for the loc. *ahyāyā* the development is more complicated. Skt. has *asyām*, with an *m* suffix not found in other languages; were we to compare the substantival loc. *senāyām*, we should be tempted to divide *senāy-ām*, and similarly *asy-ām*, and to make the added element of uncertain origin the entire *-ām*. In this way, we have perhaps *\*asī-i* as the basic form of the case, cf. masc. and neut. *asm-i-n*; *\*asīi-ām* would automatically become the actual Skt. *asyām*. The Avestan *a<sup>i</sup>śhe* stands for an earlier *\*asyā*; this may be interpreted as *\*asīi* plus the postposition *ā*, so commonly attached to the Iranian locative as a formative element. The Iranian *\*ahyā* may then have been made over to *ahyāyā* in imitation of the loc. of fem. *-ā-* stems,

<sup>1</sup> Except that *ἕνεκα* is instr. in form, while *-rādiy* is loc.

<sup>2</sup> *Huius rei* is merely the gen. of neut. *hoc*, used because the simple pronoun *huius* would be ambiguous with both of the other genders.

<sup>3</sup> *AltW.* 179, s. v.

<sup>4</sup> Bartholomae, *Grundriss d. iran. Phil.* I, § 239, 2.

<sup>5</sup> And of course in the gen. sing. masc. and neut., from which it may have started; Brugmann, *Grundriss d. vgl. Gram.* II<sup>2</sup>, 2, p. 360, § 357.

such as *Aθurāyā* and *Arbairāyā*. The probability of this loc. \**avahyāyā* must be admitted, especially as the Av. shows the extension of the *-hy-* element in the gen., dat. and abl. of this stem *ava-*, though the locative unfortunately does not occur.

§ 5. We must note that in Bartholomae's assumed form \**avahyā-rādiy* the prior element contains the postposition *ā*, though the posterior element lacks it. With regard to the appearance of this postposition as a formative element of the loc. in OPers., an examination gives the following results:

Postpositive *ā* appears

in fem. proper names which are *-ā-* and *-ī-* stems:

*Aθurāyā*, *Arbairāyā*  
*Baxtriyā*, *Harauvatiyā*<sup>1</sup>

in common nouns except those used as adverbs:<sup>2</sup>

*uzmayā-patīy*, *dastayā*, *duvarayā*  
*dīpiyā*, *āpiyā*, *būmiyā*<sup>1</sup>  
*gāθavā*, *dahyauvā*  
*viθiyā*, *drayahyā*<sup>3</sup>

in pronouns:

*ahyāyā*

in all plurals:

*Mādašuvā*, *maškāuvā*, *dahyušuvā*, *aniyāuvā*

Postpositive *ā* does not appear:

in masc. proper names which are *-ō-* and *-ū-* stems:

*Arminiyaīy*, *Asagartaīy*, *Uvajaiy*, *Pārsaīy*, *Mādaīy*,  
*Mudrāyaīy*, *Hagmatānaīy*

in locative forms used as adverbs:

*ašnaiy*, *paruvaīy*, *dūraiīy* *dūraiapiy* (variously spelled)  
*ni-padiy*, *-rādiy*, *vasiīy*  
*nāma nāmā*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> If it be taken, with Brugmann, *Grundriss d. vgl. Gram.* II<sup>2</sup>, 2, p. 181, as with *-yā* by haplogy for *-yāy-ā*. If however, this *-iyā* stand merely for *-(i)īē+i, >-(i)īēi*, with later loss of the diphthong-forming element (Brugmann, *Gdr.* I<sup>2</sup>, § 223), the fact that these forms also ended in *-ā*, despite a difference of origin of that *-ā* (*ib.* II<sup>2</sup>, 2, p. 181), might throw them into the same category as those with real postpositive *-ā*, so far as the feeling of the speaker was concerned.

<sup>2</sup> On *ufraštādiy*, Bh. 4, 69, cf. § 64—69.

<sup>3</sup> *Māhyā* may belong here, but is better to be taken as gen. of the thematic stem, with Gray, *AJP.* 21, 13—14.

<sup>4</sup> *Nāma* shows by its final short *a* that a weak consonant, an earlier *s* or *t* or *n*, is implied; in this word it can be only *n*. As *nāma* is always

§ 6. Now in Bartholomae's \**avahyā-rādiy*, we note that the prior element has the postpositive *ā*, while the second lacks it. This is not fatal to his explanation, for the *ā*, according to our theory of the history of the pronominal loc. fem., is earlier there than in nouns; but the great difficulty is the length of the final *a* of \**avahyā*, and its consistent shortness in the compound *avahyarādiy*. Foy<sup>1</sup> attempts to explain this on the ground of lawless writing of the final vowel before an enclitic and before the second element of compounds. Let us see how far the phenomena bear out his claim.

§ 7. The possible graphic finals before enclitics are *m š u i ā a*. Words ending in the consonants offer no peculiarities. Final *u* is regularly written *uv*; before enclitics and in compounds<sup>2</sup> we commonly find this form, but also the plain *u*:

*hauv-maiy* Bh. 2, 79; 3, 11; *hauv-taiy* Dar. NRa 57; *hauv-ciγ* Dar. Pers. e 23—24; *hauv-am* Bh. 1, 29; but also *hau-šaiy* Dar. Pers. d 3

*paruvzanānām* Xerx. Pers. b 15—16, da 11 = db 15—16, *paruv zanānām* Xerx. Pers. a 8, ca 7 = cb 11—12; Xerx. Van 12; *paruzanānām* Dar. Elv. 15—16; Xerx. Elv. 15—16; cf. also *paruvnām* and *parūnām*, gen. plur. of *paruv*.

§ 8. Final *i* is written *iy*, except after *h*, where we have *y* alone; before enclitics the *y* ordinarily disappears, so that final *hy* becomes *-ha-*:

*naiy-diš* Bh. 4, 73. 78; *nai-maiy* Bh. 4, 64; *nai-šim* Bh. 4, 49  
*tyai-šaiy* Bh. 1, 57; 2, 77; 3, 48. 51. 74. 90. 91  
*imai-vā* Bh. 4, 71. 73. 77

---

used to denote specification, it must be *nāman*, a suffixless loc. in adverbial use. This form is used when the generic noun is masc. or neut. (as in Bh. 3, 12, *martiya Frāda nāma*, 3, 22 *Tāravā nāma vardanam*), but is written with the final vowel long when the generic word is fem. (as in Bh. 2, 27—28 *Kanpada nāmā dahyāuš*, 2, 39 *Tigra nāmā didā*); Tolman's formulation, *Lex.* 105, seems to be the best, that the *nāmā* has taken the final long vowel because of the association with a feminine noun, and thus secures apparent agreement with it. This variation in the final vowel shows that the word was no longer felt to be distinctly a living case-form in the paradigm, but rather a word of an adverbial use. But cf. Gray, *IF.* 11, 307—313.

<sup>1</sup> *KZ.* 35, 8—10.

<sup>2</sup> In the following lists compounds are included only so far as they present features of interest. In nominal compounds, the prior element is usually a stem in stem form, or a prefix which is indeclinable. In verbs, the prefix is always in the correct phonetic form.

*dūrai-apiy* Dar. NRa 12; *dūray-apiy* Dar. NRa 46; cf. *dūraiṽ apiy* Xerx. Pers. a 9, b 18—19, da 13 = db 18—19; Sz. c 6; Dar. Elv. 18—19, Xerx. Elv. 18; Xerx. Van 14

*raucapati-vā* Bh. 1, 20

*yadi-patiy* Dar. NRa 38

*ni-padiy* Bh. 2, 73; 3, 73

*abiy-para*(<sup>?</sup>; written *ab<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>pa<sup>ra</sup>*) Art. Sus. a 4

*paribarāha-diš* Bh. 4, 74

*vikanāha-diš* Bh. 4, 77

§ 9. Before taking up those combinations in which the sound before the enclitic (or second element of a compound) is short or long *ā*, certain tentative conclusions may be drawn, as follows: Before an enclitic, vowels may keep their writing just as when in the final position, or may be written as when medial in a word; *-hy*, being written *-h<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>* and not *-h<sup>a</sup>i<sup>y</sup><sup>a</sup>*, becomes the illogical *-ha-* on losing the *y*. In accordance with this we should expect to find that a final *-ā*, whether absolutely final or supported by a weak consonant, retains its length before an enclitic; that a final *-ā*, written without length because supported by a weak consonant, appears as a short before an enclitic; that a final *-ā*, written with length because absolutely final, before an enclitic appears sometimes as long and sometimes with its etymological shortness. The instances follow:

§ 10. Final *-ā*, supported by a weak consonant:

*ā<sup>h</sup>*: *Auramazdā-maiy* Bh. 1, 24—25. 25. 55. 87. 94; 2, 24. 34. 40. 45. 54. 60. 68. 86. 96; 3, 6. 16—17. 37. 44—45. 61—62. 66—67. 87; 4, 60; Dar. NRb 49. *Auramazdā-maiy* Dar. NRa 50 is a dubious reading; Tolm. *Cun. Sup.* 58 indicates that it was written *Auramazdā-(ma)iy*, with length of the *ā* and accidental omission of the next character.

*Auramazdā-tay* Bh. 4, 58

*Auramazdā-taiy* Bh. 4, 78

*ufraštā-diy* Bh. 4, 69<sup>1</sup>

*Ariyā-ramna* Bh. 1, 5: a 7 (the first element nom. plur.<sup>2</sup>)

*ā<sup>t</sup>*:<sup>3</sup> *hyā-param* Bh. 3, 43. 64—65; cf. § 36 fn.

§ 11. Final *-ā*, not supported by any weak consonant:

<sup>1</sup> See § 64—69.

<sup>2</sup> Bartholomae, *AtW.* 199 (or accusative plural?).

<sup>3</sup> I use the superposed *t* to indicate both *t* and *d* in this position.

*hacā-ma* (for length, cf. Skt. *sacā*) Bh. 1, 19. 23; 2, 6. 12. 16.

93; 3, 27. 78. 81; 5, 5; Dar. Pers. e 9; Dar. NRa 20

*yathā-šām* (cf. Skt. *yathā*) Bh. 1, 23

*avaθā-šaiy* (with the same ending as the preceding) Bh. 2, 30. 50; 3, 14

*avaθā-šām* Bh. 2, 20. 27. 36—37. 42. 47. 56. 62. 83. 98; 3, 8. 19. 40. 47. 57. 63—64. 69. 85

*avaθā-diš* Bh. 5, 17. 33

*mā-tya* (cf. Skt. *mā*) Bh. 1, 52; 4, 43. 48. 71

*tyā-diš* (neut. plur., cf. Vedic *tā*) Bh. 1, 65

loc. -*ā* (identical with the Skt. prep. and verbal prefix *ā*) :

*duvarayā-maiy* Bh. 2, 75. 89—90; *uzmayā-patīy* Bh. 2, 76. 91; 3, 52. 92

*viθā-patīy* (instr., cf. Skt. *viṣā*) Bh. 3, 26

*duvitā-paranam* (cf. Skt. *dvitā*) Bh. 1, 10; a 17

§ 12. Final -*a*, supported by a weak consonant :

*a<sup>h</sup>* : in the nom. sing. masc. of -*ō*- stems :

*kāra-šim* Bh. 1, 50; *haruva-šim* Bh. 2, 75. 90; *apanyāka-ma*  
Art. Sus. a 3

*hya-šām*<sup>1</sup> Bh. 2, 13; *h[ya-šaiy]* Bh. 2, 95; *hya-vā* Bh. 4, 68  
in an old combination retaining the *s* :

*kaš-ciṣ* Bh. 1, 49. 53

in [*ta*] *ra-draya* Dar. NRa 28—29 (cf. Skt. *tiras*)

in the acc. sing. neut. of -*es*- stems :

*rauca-pativā* Bh. 1. 20

in the stem form of the same, in compounds :

a late compound : *zūra-kara* Bh. 4, 64. 68

an early compound : *Vahyaz-dāta* Bh. 3, 22. 27—28. 35. 38—  
39. 41. 46. 48. 50. 54. 60. 70—71; 4, 26; h 1—2

*a<sup>t</sup>* : all pronominal neut. sing. :

*tya-maiy* Xerx. Pers. a 19—20, b 24. 30, ca 13 = cb 22—23,  
da 19 = db 28; Dar. NRb 48

*tya-taiy* Dar. NRb 53

*tya-šām* Bh. 1, 19; Dar. NRa 20, 36—37

*tya-patīy* Xerx. Pers. a 15

*mātya-mām* Bh. 1, 52

*aita-maiy* Dar. Pers. d. 22—23; Dar. NRa 54—55

*ava-taiy* Bh. 4, 76. 79

<sup>1</sup> The pronoun \**siō* has manifestly taken on the nominal ending *s* in OPers., as is shown by the independent writing *hya*, without length of the final vowel; cf. Skt. *syas sa-s*, Av. *hō* (< \**so-s*).



*ava-diš* Dar. NRa 21

*ava-parā* Bh. 2, 72; 3, 72—73

*pasāva-dim* Dar. NRa 33; *pasāva-šim* Bh. 2, 76. 90; *pasāva-saiy* Bh. 2, 88

old combinations, showing the final *d* of the prior element:

*avaš-ciṃy* Xerx. Pers. a 20, ca 14 = cb 24

*ciš-ciṃy* Bh. 1, 53

*aniyaš-ciṃy* Bh. 4, 46; Xerx. Pers. a 13

§ 13. Absolutely final *-a*, written *-ā* when no enclitic follows:<sup>1</sup>

*utā-maiy* (cf. Skt. *uta*) Bh. 4, 46; Dar. NRa 52—53, NRb 7

*utā-maiy* Xerx. Pers. a 15. 18—19, b 29, da 18—19 = db 27

*utā-taiy* Bh. 4, 56. 58. 73—74. 75. 77—78. 79

*utā-šaiy* Bh. 2, 74—75. 89

*utā-šim* Bh. 5, 13. 26—27

*utā-šām* Bh. 3, 57; 5, 15

*ada-kaiy* (cf. Skt. *adha*) Bh. 2, 11. 24; 4, 81. 82; 5, 15

*ada-taiy* Dar. NRa 43, 45

*xšapa-vā* (acc. sing. fem. of consonantal stem<sup>2</sup>) Bh. 1, 20

*mana-cā* (vowel quantity as in Skt. *mama*) Dar. Pers. d 9—10

*avada-šim* (vowel quantity as in *ada-*) Bh. 1, 59

*avadā-šim* Bh. 3, 74

*avada-šiš* Bh. 3, 52

*avada-ša* Bh. 1, 37; 3, 42. 80<sup>3</sup>

*Ariya ciθra* (a compound written as two words) Dar. NRa 14—15

*fra-haravam* (cf. Skt. *pra*) Bh. 1, 17

<sup>1</sup> Nothing inconsistent with what has been found, would be discovered by a listing of the rather uncertain interpretations *kamna-ma* Bh. 2, 19; *duvitīya-ma* Bh. 3, 24; *apara-ma* Bh. 4, 37. 68. 87 (42. 48. 70); nor by the inclusion of the passages where enclisis is expected, but the words are separated before *di[š]* Bh. 4, 34. 35. 36, and *daiy* Bh. 5, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Nothing is gained by Bartholomae's assumption, *AiW.* 548, that we are to understand *xšapah-* in riming assimilation to the following *raucah-*. In Dar. Pers. e 13—14, a riming pair consists of a gen. and a loc.: *tyaiy uškahyā utā tyaiy drayahyā*, "those who (are) of the mainland and those who (are) by the sea". In this also the rime is graphic merely, for the gen. *uškahyā* really has a short final vowel, while the loc. *drayahyā* ends in the etymologically long postposition *ā*. But in both the difference in sound would have been slight, even if there was no actual phonetic assimilation in practice.

<sup>3</sup> The main exception to this graphic length seems to be when the

§ 14. The results are precisely what we anticipated: an etymologically long final *a* remains long before an enclitic; an etymologically short final *a* remains short if absolutely final in the separate word, and if graphically long in the separately written word, may keep that graphic length before the enclitic or may have its proper short quantity. It is therefore quite out of the question for *avahya-rādiy* to represent *\*avahyā-rādiy*, for an etymologically long final vowel in this position never shortens before an enclitic or in compounds. The first element of the word is therefore gen. sing. neut. of the pronoun, and the comparisons with the Greek *τούτου ἕνεκα* and the Latin *huius rei causā* are valid. But Greek presents a still closer parallel, even to the fusion of the two words into one, in *τούνεκα οὔνεκα*.

## II. Taumā.

§ 15. The word *taumā* 'family' has always offered a certain amount of difficulty. It is natural to equate it with late Avestan *taoxman-* N. 'Same, Keim, (Plur.) Verwandtschaft', and Skt. *tókman-* M. 'young blade of corn, esp. of barley, malt'. The problem appears when we observe that modern Pers. has *tuhm*, showing the survival of the *x*, and that even in OPers. we have the *x* before *m* in the proper names *Taxmaspāda* and *Ciθra<sup>a</sup>taxma*, both containing the element seen in Avestan *taxma-* 'fortis, tapfer, tüchtig, energisch, heldenhaft', of which the modern representation in Persian is *tahm*.

---

word with such an ending forms a unit with the following word. The examples are:

Gen. of a month name in *-ahya* before *māhyā* Bh. 1, 37—38. 42. 89. 96; 2, 26. 36. 41. 56. 61—62. 69. 98; 3, 7—8. 18. 39. 46—47. 63. 68.

Gen. of a personal name in *-ahya* before *puθra* Bh. 3, 79. 81; 4, 14. 30; d 5—6; i 7—8; Seal a 7—8; but more often *-ahyā* is written, Bh. 1, 3. 74. 77—78. 79; 4, 83. 83—84. 85; a 3; Dar. Pers. a 4—5, &c.

*Uvarštrahya taumāyā* Bh. 4, 19. 22; e 7—8; g 8—11; but also *Uvarštrahyā taumāyā* Bh. 2, 15—16. 81.

*Aurahya Mazdāha* Xerx. Pers. ca 10 = cb 17; the word is elsewhere a compound declinable only in the second element.

Besides these, there is a set of examples in the third column of the Behistan inscription within a few lines of each other, which seem to rest upon the carelessness or wilfulness of the scribe who cut the words. We have *Vahyazdātahya* 3, 38—39. 46, *āhanta* 3, 49. 51; but within the same passage there are numerous examples of finals which are graphically long though phonetically short, so that no real inference may be drawn.

Both of these sets of examples I take as an indication that the length of the absolutely final short *a* is purely graphic.

§ 16. The problem is farther complicated by the fact that in certain passages the word *taumā* appears not to mean 'family', but 'power, strength, possibility'; this, if a word of separate etymology, as seems certain, is a derivate of the root *tu-* 'be strong', found in Skt. and in Avestan, and in practically all of the Indo-European languages. The meaning 'power' is claimed for the word in Bh. 4, 74. 78, and 5, 19. 35; in the last two passages the word rests upon restorations, though they seem quite certain.

§ 17. The best argument for the meaning 'power' seems to be given by Hoffmann-Kutschke, in a letter to Tolman (quoted *Lex.* p. 91): "Es kann doch nicht bedeuten, *du bewahre, so lange deine Familie lebt*; man kann doch nur schützen, *so lange man selbst lebt*. Übrigens steht im Elamischen nicht das Ideogramm GUL, Familie".

§ 18. Perhaps it would be well to see to what persons or groups of persons the word *taumā* is applied, and in what cases: The *taumā* of Darius:

Nom. 1, 8; 4, 64; a 13

Abl. *taumāyā*, 1, 61—2

Gen. *taumāyā*, 1, 9. 28—29. 45. 49; a 15

The *taumā* of Uvaxštra or Cyaxares:

Gen. *taumāyā*, 2, 16. 81; 4, 19—20. 22; e 8; g 10—11

The *taumā* of anyone who does certain things:

Nom. 4, 56, 58—59. 74. 75. 78. 79; 5, 19. 35

Acc. 4, 88 (restored, but apparently [*tau*]mām).

§ 19. The word 'family' is manifestly an *-ā-stem*, though the corresponding words in Skt. and Av. are neut. *-n-* stems;<sup>1</sup> but the word for 'power' occurs only in the nom., and may be a neut. *-n-* stem, with purely graphic length of the nom. *-a*, and it is so interpreted.<sup>2</sup> The loss of the *-x-* in the word 'family' has been explained<sup>3</sup> on the supposition that *x* before *m* was lost after diphthongs but not after short vowels, so that we have *taumā* and *taxma-* corresponding to Av. *taoxman-* and *taxma-*; modern Pers. *tuhm* would come from the dialect represented by Avestan, not from a dialect which lost the *x* in this position.

§ 20. Possibly, however, another factor entered into the loss of the *x*; for it is notable that the word 'family' is used very

<sup>1</sup> J. Schmidt, *Pluralbildungen*, 94.

<sup>2</sup> Foy, *KZ.* 35, 47; Bartholomae, *AiW.* 623; &c.

<sup>3</sup> Foy, *KZ.* 35, 6.

largely of one or the other of the two royal lines of the country, that of Cyaxares and that of Darius himself. Granted \**tauxmā* 'family' and *taumā* 'power', the frequent use of the former in the sense of 'royal family' might cause it to lose one sound, the *x*, and assimilate itself to the form of the word for 'power.' In this way we have two identical words of different meanings and of different origins, whose approach to one another in meaning has drawn them together in form as well. For a parallel development in meaning, we might cite the English word *dynasty* 'a race or succession of kings, of the same line or family', which has developed from an older meaning, now obsolete, 'sovereignty, lordship, dominion', which accords with the meaning of the Greek original.

### III. Apariyāya, Bh. 1, 23.

§ 21. Bh. 1, § 8, 20—24:

	<i>θātiy</i> [ <i>Dāra</i> ] <i>yava-</i>	20
<i>uš xšāyaθiya</i>	<i>antar imā dahyāva martiya hya āgar[tā] āha avam u-</i>	21
<i>bartam abaram hya araika āha avam ufrastam aparsam vašn[ā] Auramazdā-</i>		22
<i>ha imā dahyāva tyena<sup>1</sup> manā dātū aparaiyaya yaθāšām hacāma aθah-</i>		23
<i>ya [a]vaθā akunavayantā</i>		24

"Says Darius the king: Within these countries what man was watchful him well esteemed I esteemed; who was an enemy, him well punished I punished; by the grace of Ahura Mazda these countries respected my laws; as it was commanded by me to them, so they did".—Tolman's translation, *Lex.*, p. 5.

§ 22. The verb in 23, given above in literal transcription of the syllabic characters, and rendered 'respected' by Tolman, is somewhat troublesome. There can be no doubt that it is a third plural of the imperfect tense, with *dahyāva* as subject and *dātū* as object; and there is little variation in the interpretation: cf., in addition to Tolman's version, the following:

Bartholomae, *AW.* 1765, "diese Länder zeigten meinen Gesetzen Ehrfurcht".

King-Thompson, "These lands have conformed to my decrees".

Weissbach-Bang II, "... haben sich diese Länder nach meinem Gesetze gerichtet".

§ 23. Yet the normalized spelling is a matter of dispute. Bartholomae, followed by Tolman, writes *āpariyāya* for \**aha-*

<sup>1</sup> For *tyā*; see § 45.

*pariyāya*<sup>n</sup>, with loss of the intervocalic *h*; cognate, Skt. *saparyati* 'serve' attentively, honor, worship, adore'. King-Thompson write *apariyāya*, without comment. Weissbach-Bang<sup>1</sup> suggest *upariyāya*, under the influence of Bh. 4, 64—65 *upariy-[āyam]*, and this emendation is retained by Weissbach, in his *Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*; but Tolman's conjecture<sup>2</sup> *upariy-[axšayaiy]* seems better in 4, 64—65. At any rate, since the examination of the inscription by Jackson and by King-Thompson, we should be very slow in altering the reading of actually preserved signs. In the present instance, no doubts are recorded as to the identity of the actual signs on the rock; and Weissbach-Bang's *upariyāya* may therefore be left out of consideration. As for *āpariyāya*, from *\*ahapariyāya*, two objections may be made.

§ 24. First: Is the loss of intervocalic *h* in such combinations a well attested phenomenon? It is true that for some mysterious reason the character for *h<sup>a</sup>* (there was no special sign either for *h<sup>i</sup>* or for *h<sup>u</sup>*) was never written before *u*, but merely omitted; and that even when the *u* was purely graphic in the group *uv* representing postconsonantal *u*, the *-hv-* is written *-uv-*. Before *i*, also, there was a reluctance to employ *ha*; final *-hi* is always written *-h<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>*, = *hy*: *āhy*, *vikanāhy*, *xšnāsāhy*, *θahyāmahy*, *patiparsāhy*, *paribarāhy*, *vaināhy*. In accordance with the regular writing of final *i* as *iy*, we should have expected *-hiy* in these words. Similarly, though postconsonantal *y* is written *iy*, we find the unaltered *-hy-*, not *-hiy-*: *hya*, *dahyāva*, *avahyā*, &c. By way of exception, *ah<sup>a</sup>iy<sup>a</sup>ay<sup>a</sup>* = *ahiyāya* is written Xerx. Pers. b 17, da 12 = db 17, Xerx. Elv. 17; but there are about a score of occurrences of *ah<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>ay<sup>a</sup>* = *ahyāyā*. The only other real example of *hi* is in the initial position: *h<sup>a</sup>iḏ<sup>u</sup>uš<sup>a</sup>* = *hiḏuš*. Medially, the sign *h<sup>a</sup>* seems to do duty for *hi*: *anahata* = Av. *anāhita-*, Greek (transliteration) 'Αναίτης; *parikarāhadiš*, *vikanāhadiš*, *paribarāhadiš*, containing the ending *-hy* (graphic for *-hi*) plus the enclitic pronoun *diš*. *Aištata* is unique, representing *a<sup>h</sup>ištata*; here, apparently, the vowel quality was more important for the understanding of the word than was the consonant, and the latter was accordingly omitted as before *u*.

<sup>1</sup> II, p. XI.

<sup>2</sup> *Lex.* p. 28, p. 85, with discussion.

§ 25. With the combination *-aha-* the procedure is somewhat different. This occurs unaltered in the following positions:<sup>1</sup>

When the *h* is initial in the second element of a compound:

*fraharava-*, *avahar-* (2, 94)

When the *h* is the final element of a nominal stem:

*-mazdāhā*, *-mazdāha*, *nāham*

When the *h* is part of the double plural ending:

*aniyāha*, *bagāha*

When the *h* is final in a root before a formative suffix:

*āvahanam*, *vahauka*, *θūravāharā-*

When the *h* is final in a verbal root before the ending:

*āham*, *āha*, *āha<sup>n</sup>*, *āha<sup>n</sup>tā*, *aθaham*, *aθaha*

When the *h* is initial in the personal ending of verbs:

*maniyāhaiy*

When the *h* is initial in the verbal root after the augment:

*frāha<sup>n</sup>jam*, = *\*fra-aha<sup>n</sup>jam*

§ 26. Over against these examples we must set certain ones in which, apparently, the *h* has fallen out and contraction has resulted:

*āhy* 'sit' = *\*ahahy*

*θāhy* 'dicis' = *\*θahahy*

*θātiy* 'dicit' = *\*θahatiy*

*māhyā* gen. 'mensis' = *\*māhahyā<sup>2</sup>* (stem as in Av. *mā<sup>n</sup>ha<sup>2</sup>*;  
Skt. *māsa-*)

*Vivāna* proper name = *\*Vivahana<sup>3</sup>*

*āpariyāya<sup>n</sup>* = *\*ahapariyāya<sup>n</sup>*

§ 27. But of these six examples, it is notable that three, *āhy*, *θāhy* and *māhyā<sup>4</sup>*, contain the succession *-ahah-*, so that either dissimilative loss of the sound *h* or of the group *ah* might take place. In connection with *āhy*, it is striking that the third person, *ahatiy*, suffered no loss of the *h*; this suggests that the proportion (ind.) *\*barahy*: (subj.) *barāhy* = (ind.) *\*ahy*: (subj.) *āhy* had an influence, while in the third person the ind.

<sup>1</sup> Two words of doubtful interpretation should be listed: *aθahaya* (probably = *aθahya*); *aθahavaja* (read by King-Thompson, Bh. 4, 90).

<sup>2</sup> With Gray, *AJP.* 21, 13—14; the other interpretation, as a loc. sing. to *māh-*, with postpositive *ā*, removes it from this category.

<sup>3</sup> So Justi, *Iran. Namenbuch*, 374, comparing Av. *vīva<sup>n</sup>hana-*, patronymic adj. to *Vivahvant-*, = Skt. *Vivasvant-*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. second footnote preceding.

*astiy* does not lend itself to the development of an *\*ātiy* for *ahatīy*. *Ṡātīy* is a better example, but may merely have followed its own second singular. As for *Vivāna*, other etymologies from a root *vā-* or *van-*, with the prefix *vi-*, must be admitted as possible. Yet even if these examples be recognized as valid occurrences of loss of *h* in the group *aha*, we are confronted with the fact that in *āpariyāya*<sup>n</sup> there is the influence of the present *\*hapariya-* to resist the tendency to the loss of *h*; in *frāha*<sup>n</sup>*jam*, the nearest parallel, the *h* has not disappeared. Even apart from that, there are many more instances of the retention of *h* than of the loss. Thus an explanation of *āpariyāya*<sup>n</sup> as from *\*ahap-* is unlikely.

§ 28. Besides this, no one, so far as I am aware, has attempted to explain the doubled *-ya-* of this verb. To a Skt. *asaparyan* we should expect, if for purposes of argument the loss of the *h* be admitted, a corresponding OPers. *\*āpariya*<sup>n</sup>, not an *āpariyāya*<sup>n</sup>. It is difficult to see how this extra syllable could be explained.

§ 29. Because of these two difficulties I suggest that we read, with King-Thompson, *apariyāya*<sup>n</sup>; and that we interpret as a doubly augmented imperfect of the root *i-* 'go', with the prefix *pariy-*. No alteration in the meaning is suggested. The phonetic and formal equivalent in Greek would be *\*ἐ-περιῆεν*, in Skt. *\*a-pary-āyan*.

§ 30. Compound verbs which become separated from their simple forms, either in form or in meaning, are liable to take the augment, not where it belongs, just before the uncompounded verb, but before the prefix, or in both places. The following examples are quotable from Greek:<sup>1</sup>

Present	Regular Augment	Initial Augment	Double Augment
ἀμπίσχομαι		ἡμπισχόμεν	ἡμπεσχόμεν ἡμπειχόμεν
ἀμφιγινώω		ἡμφιγινόεον	ἡμφεγινόεον ἡμφεγινόησα
ἀμφιέννῃμι		ἡμφιέσα	
ἀμφισ-βητέω felt as ἀμφι- σβητέω		ἡμφισβήτουν	ἡμφεσβήτουν
ἀνέχω		ἡνσχόμεν	ἡνέσχόμεν ἡνειχόμεν
ἀφίημι	ἀφίην		ἡφίην

<sup>1</sup> Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, § 544.

ἐνοχλέω

ἡνώχλουν

ἡνώχλησα

καθέζομαι

ἐκαθεζόμην

καθεύδω

καθηῦδον

ἐκάθευδον

καθίζω

ἐκάθιζον

καθίσα

ἐκάθισα

Hom. καθεῖσα

In Skt., Whitney<sup>1</sup> quotes *apalāyīṣṭhās*, *apalāyata*, *apalāyanta* from *palāy*, a disguised compound of *parā+i-*, with initial augment instead of augment after the prefix; Brugmann<sup>2</sup> cites *apīdayat* and *asambhramat*, with initial augment, and *apraīṣīt*, with double augment, from *\*a-pra-āiṣīt*. Irregular or double augment, then, is a phenomenon appearing to a certain extent in the commoner verbs when the feeling for the composition has become more or less obscured.

§ 31. For a semantic parallel to our assumed OPers. *pariy-ay-* 'go round', hence 'respect, observe', we may draw not only upon the compounds of *i-* 'go', but upon other roots of the meanings 'go', 'be,' 'sit', 'lie', all of which are frequently colorless and tend toward a mere copula, so that in composition the main portion of the meaning is given by the prefixed element. We find:

*pari+i-* (Skt.), 'circumambulate' (MW.<sup>3</sup>), 'umgeben, bittend umwandern, in seine Gewalt kommen' (Gr.<sup>4</sup>)

*pari+ā+i-* (Skt.), 'roam about, go round, circumambulate' (MW.)

*pa'ri+ah-* (Av.), 'um Jemand (abl.) sein, ihn begleiten' (Bthl.<sup>5</sup>)

*pari+ās-* (Skt.) 'sit or assemble around anyone (acc.)' (MW.); 'um Jemand (acc.) herumsitzen, ihn umlagern, besonders verehrend' (Gr.)

*pari-śad-* (Skt.), 'sit around, besiege, beset' (MW.)

*pari-śād-* (Skt.), subst. fem., 'assembly, meeting, group, circle' (MW.)

<sup>1</sup> *Sanskrit Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, § 1087 c.

<sup>2</sup> *Comparative Grammar*, trans. into Eng., IV, 25, § 477.

<sup>3</sup> Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit English Dictionary*.

<sup>4</sup> Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rigveda*.

<sup>5</sup> Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*.





reads *daršma*<sup>n</sup>, and explains as a suffixless gen.-abl. sing. form of the neuter *-n*- stem; he translates "Die Leute fürchteten von seiner Gewalttätigkeit". Tolman adopts his reading, and translates "The people feared him for his tyranny". King-Thompson, rather non-committally, transliterate *daršama*, and translate "The people feared him exceedingly". Weissbach reads *daršam*<sup>a</sup>.

§ 35. In every interpretation of the passage, the disputed word must be made the object of the preposition *hacā*, since *hacā* is not used independently as an adverb, and cannot govern the preceding *-šim*.<sup>1</sup> *Hacā* occurs in a number of passages on the OPers. inscriptions, always with the ablative case or with an adverb of ablatival meaning except in a few instances easily explainable, later discussed. Further, the phrases denote place from which, separation, cause, agent, and time from which. The table shows the distribution:

	Place From	Sepa- ration	Cause	Agent	Time From
ō-stem abl. in <i>-ā</i> <sup>2</sup>	2	8			
ā-stem abl. in <i>-āyā</i>	2	3			
u-stem abl. in <i>-auš</i>	1				
Pronominal abl. <i>ma</i>		7	2	3	
Abl. adverb in <i>-ša</i>	3				
“ “ “ <i>-ta</i>					5
<i>aniyanā</i> (see below)			2		
<i>rauta</i> ( “ “ )	1				
<i>darāšam</i> <sup>a</sup>			1		

masc. pl. pronouns of the third person: *avaiy*, *imaiy*, *imai*-, *daiy*. Since the acc. plur. of fem. *-ā*- stems is like the nom. plur., and the neut. always has the same form in the nom. and acc., it appears that there are no forms of the acc. plur. in OPers. which can be regarded as distinctively acc. in origin, except the enclitic pronouns *šiš* and *diš*, to which, properly, there is no nom. form; for *daiy* (nom. form in acc. use) is clearly analogical in origin. Where therefore the nom. and acc. plur. did not fall together in OPers. by the working of phonetic processes, the nom. form drove out the acc. and was used in its stead. We may compare the extension of the instr. plur. form to nom. usage (*raucabiš*) and to acc. usage (*viṭabiš* Bh. 1, 65).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bartholomae, *AiW.* 700, s. v. *daršman*-, Note 1; despite Foy, *KZ.* 35, 31—32.

<sup>2</sup> I take *dušiyārā*, acc. *-ram*, as not a consonantal stem (Bartholomae, *AiW.* 754), but an *-o*-stem; for the change of the declensional class in compounds, cf. Brugmann, *Gdr.* II<sup>2</sup>, 1, p. 60.

§ 36. Of these, only the last three items are even in appearance other than ablative.<sup>1</sup> *Aniyanā* (Dar. Pers. d 11. 20) has the form of an instrumental, cf. Av. instr. *kana*; but it may be rather an ablative built upon the instrumental case suffix, just as the locative adverb *yanaiy* is built upon the instr. *\*yanā*.<sup>2</sup>

§ 37. Matters are different with *rauta*. The passage reads: Suez c 8—10:

<i>adam ni[yaš]tāyam imām [yuviyā-]</i>	8
<i>m kantanaiy hacā Pirāva nāma rauta tya Muḍrāyiy danu[vatīy ab-]</i>	9
<i>iy draya tya hacā Pārsā aitiy</i>	10

“I commanded to dig this canal from the Nile by name a river which flows in Egypt, to the sea which goes from Persia”.—Tolman’s translation, *Lex.* p. 51.

§ 38. The syntax of the naming phrases is peculiar, for the OPers. avoided using them in any case but the nominative, except in the carelessly and incorrectly written Art. Pers. a 19.

<sup>1</sup> The forms in *-ā* may be instr., those in *-āyā* may be gen. or possibly even instr., that in *-auš* may be gen.; but *ma* and the forms in *-ša -ta* are distinctly abl. So long as other evidence fails, it is better to regard them as all of the same case, rather than as of several different cases.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Fr. Müller, *WZKM.* 7, 112; Foy, *KZ.* 35, 10. It is fairly to be questioned whether the weak final consonants *s t d n* were utterly lost, since they prevent graphic length of a preceding short vowel in the OPers. inscriptions. When the masc. and neut. abl. sing. *\*aniasmād* became OPers. *\*aniyamād*, it may easily have become *aniyanād* by the influence of the instr. *\*aniyānā*, with the help of abl. *-ād*, instr. *-ā* in *-o-* stems. In the same way the loc. *\*yamīy* (< *\*iasmi*) may have become either *yanaiy* (as commonly read) by the influence of instr. *\*yanā* and the loc. *-aiy* of *-o-* stems, or even *yaniy* (an equally possible reading of *yanaiya*), after the pronominal form only. Against this is the absence of the postposition *ā* in all these forms at the time when the remaking of *yanaiy* must have occurred, although the conditions for such remaking are not present until the *h* before *m* has disappeared, a distinctly OPers. phenomenon not common to Av.

The scanty appearance of the gender-showing pronouns in the instr., abl. and loc. sing. masc. and neut. allows us to conjecture that the instrumental *-nā* may have had a considerable extension to the two other cases; we have only instr. masc. *anā* (Dar. Pers. e 8). and the ablatival adverbs *avā* (Bh. 4, 51) and *hyā-* in *hyā-param* (Bh. 3, 43. 64—65; but *hyā*, Dar. Pers. e 22, is surely nom. sing. fem., see Foy, *KZ.* 37, 561, and not an ablatival adverb, despite Bartholomae, *IF.* 12, 127 and *ÄiW.* 1844).

With reference to *hyā-*, the scope of the *tya-* and the *hya-* stems is the same in OPers. at that of *tya-* and *sya-* in Skt., or of *ta-* and *sa-*, Av. *ha-*, in Skt. and Av. Thus we have in OPers.:

20 = b 25. 26. Elsewhere the phrase stands in the nominative, except for the *nāma*<sup>1</sup>; a pronoun or adverb then follows,<sup>2</sup> setting the phrase into its proper syntax, as follows:

The naming phrase has the copula verb expressed:

Bh. 1, 30, not followed merely by a pronoun.

Bh. 1, 36; 4, 8, followed by the pronoun *hauv*.

The naming phrase has no verb expressed; but is taken up by

*hauvam* Bh. 1, 28.

*hauv* Bh. 1, 74. 77; 2, 8—9. 14. 79; 3, 11. 22. 78; 4, 10. 12—13. 15—16. 18. 20. 23. 26. 29; 5, 4.

*avam* (acc. masc.) Bh. 2, 19. 29. 49. 82; 3, 12. 31. 56. 84; 5, 5. 8. 27.

*avadā* (adv. 'there, thither') Bh. 1, 58. 58—59. 92; 2, 9. 22. 27—28. 33. 39. 44. 53. 59. 65. 95; 3, 5. 22. 23. 34. 44. 51. 61. 66.

*hacā avadaša* (adv. phrase 'thence') Bh. 1, 37; 3, 79.

*avaparā* (compound adv. 'along there') Bh. 2, 72; 3, 72.

The naming phrases are appositives to a preceding nominative with a verb expressed:

Bh. 4, 83 bis. 84 bis. 85. 86.

The naming phrase is nominative by anacoluthon for the accusative:

---

	Masc.	Fem.	Neut.
Sing. nom.	<i>hya</i>	<i>hyā</i>	<i>tya</i>
acc.	<i>tyam</i>	<i>tyām</i>	<i>tya</i>
Plur. nom.	<i>tyaiy</i>	<i>tyā</i>	
acc.		<i>tyā</i>	<i>tyā</i>
gen.	<i>tyāišām</i>		

The *hya*-stem is thus restricted to the nom. sing. masc. and fem., as in other languages, except that it appears in the adverbial *hyā-* in *hyā-param*; but similar extension in adverbs appears in other languages also, as in Greek *ōs*, 'thus', though the *so*-stem was in Greek under the old restriction in the paradigm, but for an extension to the same forms of the plural in a few dialects.

The two OPers. ablative adverbs show no sign of the instr. suffix, and for this reason: being adverbs, they are outside the paradigmatic stress. Consequently they do not prove that the extension of the instrumental *-n*-may not have taken place in OPers. in certain cases of the pronominal masc. and neut. sing., just as the *-sy-* element was\* extended in the fem. sing. But for *tyanā*, Bh. 1, 23, cf. § 45.

<sup>1</sup> For the form and syntax of this word, see § 5 fn.

<sup>2</sup> Except in the brief Seal Insc. a.

Bh. 3, 12—14.	<i>pasā-</i>	12
<i>va adam frāišayam Dādaršiš nāma Pārsa manā bandaka Bāxtriy-</i>		13
<i>ā xšaθrapāvā abiy avam</i>		14

“Afterwards I sent forth a Persian, Dādarši by name, my kinsman, satrap in Bactria, against him (= Frāda)”. It need not surprise us then that in Suez c 9 the apparent object of the preposition *hacā* is, by the same anacoluthon as in Bh. 3, 13, really a nominative.<sup>1</sup>

§ 39. Thus the preposition *hacā* governs in OPers. only the ablative case, or possibly the abl. and the instr., if *aniyanā* is really an instr. The same preposition in Skt., *sacā*, means ‘with’ and governs the instr., rarely the abl.; the transfer of meaning from ‘with’ to the Iranian ‘from’ has been explained by Fay<sup>2</sup> as a development from hostile association. In Avestan, *hača* has the same meaning as in OPers., with the addition of ‘concerning, according to’, and governs regularly the ablative, less often the instr. or acc. We should therefore seek in Bh. 1, 50 an ablative immediately following the *hacā*.

§ 40. But before going farther along this line of thought, there is another peculiarity in the sentence *kārašim hacā d<sup>ra</sup>šm<sup>a</sup> atarsa* which has attracted attention. No other instance of this verb in the OPers. inscriptions governs the direct object. The passages are:

Bh. 2, 12, *pasāva hacā[ma atarsa<sup>n</sup> Uva]jiyā*

Bh. 5, 15: *a[dakaīy Uvaj]iyā [atarsa<sup>n</sup>]*

Dar. Pers. d 11—12: *hacā aniyanā naiy tarsatiy*

Dar. Pers. e 9: *tyā hacāma atarsa<sup>n</sup>*

Dar. Pers. e 20—21: *hacā aniyanā mā [ta]rsam.*

§ 41. Excepting the very doubtful second citation, in all of these the object of the fear is expressed by a phrase with *hacā*, while in Bh. 1, 50 we find a direct object, the enclitic pronoun *-šim*, in the accusative, followed by *hacā* and another word of somewhat doubtful interpretation. But the explanation of the direct object in this passage lies in the fact that no other of the passages contains both the personal cause of the emotion

<sup>1</sup> Thumb, *KZ.* 32, 129; Bartholomae, *BB.* 14, 249—250; wrongly Foy, *IF.* 12, 176—177, and *KZ.* 35, 31—32; cf. Tolman, *Lex.* 111. Cf. also the anacoluthon in the nom. *martiya* Bh. 4, 38. 65. 68, *kāra* Bh. 2, 31. 51, despite *kāram* Bh. 2, 84.

<sup>2</sup> *JAOS.* 31, 403—410.

and the quality or characteristic of that person which raises the fear, but only the personal cause. Either one singly is put in the abl. with *hacā*; but if both are expressed, we must have the acc. of the person and the abl. of the thing with *hacā*.<sup>1</sup>

§ 42. Again, we find the same combination of characters *d<sup>a</sup>raśama* in Bh. 4, 37 in quite a different meaning from that which it seems to have in 1, 50. The particular sentence is *hacā draugā daršam patipayauvā* "protect thyself strongly from the *Lie*"; where *daršam* is an adverb to the root in Skt. *dharṣ-*, Greek *θραρός θέρσος*, Eng. *dare*, &c. For the bearing on 1, 50, a summary of the thought of 4, 1—40, is pertinent. Darius summarizes the rebellions with which he has had to deal, and lists the rebel leaders, in this way "These was one, Gaumāta by name, a Magian; he *lied*: thus he said: I am Bardiya the son of Cyrus; he made Persia rebellious". Listing them all after this model, with the districts in which they revolted, he says, "These are the provinces which became rebellious; the *Lie* made them rebellious so that they *deceived* the people. Afterwards Ahuramazda delivered them into my hand; as was my will, so I did unto them". In the next section, he goes on, "O thou who shalt be king hereafter protect thyself strongly from the *Lie*; the man who shall be a *deceiver*, him do thou punish well (-punished) if thus thou shalt think, 'May the country be assured unto me'".

§ 43. The italicized words in these various sections are in the OPers. all derivatives of the one root *draug-*, that which appears in the Av. *Druj*, the *Lie* or evil power opposed to *Aša* or the spirit of right. Rebellion is attributed to the power of the *Lie* or *Drauga*. Now just as in the summary at Bh. 4, 8 Gaumāta is stated to have *lied* (*[ad]urujiya*), so in 1, 34 there is the statement that after Cambyzes went to Egypt, the *Lie* (*Drauga*) was abroad in the land, in Persia, in Media, and elsewhere. Then, with reference to Gaumāta himself, Darius

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the similar state of affairs in Greek with *ἀκούω*, which sometimes governs a genitive of the thing, as in Xen. *Anab.* 4, 2, 8 *ἀκούσαντες τῆς σάλπιγγος*, 5, 7, 21 *ἐξαίφνης ἀκούομεν βορύβου πολλοῦ*, and sometimes the genitive of the person and the accusative of the thing, Xen. *Anab.* 1, 2, 5 *ἐπεὶ ἤκουσε Τισσαφέρους τὸν Κύρου στόλον*, 2, 5, 16 *ἤδομαι . . ἀκούων σου φρονίμους λόγους*; though *ἀκούω* may govern singly the acc. of the thing, and various other combinations of construction as well.

writes, 1, 39, that when he rebelled, “to the people thus he lied (*[a]durujiya*), (saying) ‘I am Bardiya the son of Cyrus, (and) brother of Cambyses’”. The *Lie* therefore, the *Drauga*, was the force which impelled Gaumāta to rebellion.

§ 44. It seems a little harsh to take the word *d<sup>a</sup>raš<sup>a</sup>ma<sup>a</sup>*, occurring just twice, if we exclude the occurrences in Dar NRb because the passages are too illegible to give a connected meaning, as representing two entirely separate words.<sup>1</sup> I therefore propose to read in Bh. 1, 50, *karāšim hacā (draugā) daršam atarsa* “the people feared him excessively on account of the Lie”. This is in accord with the whole attitude of Darius toward the *Drauga*, both in this passage and more manifestly in column 4. The idiom is given in Bh. 4, 37. Paleographically, the loss is an easy example of haplography; for in the copy from which the inscription was cut, the successive characters of the three words were *h<sup>a</sup> c<sup>a</sup> a / d<sup>a</sup> r<sup>a</sup> u g<sup>a</sup> a / d<sup>a</sup> r<sup>a</sup> š<sup>a</sup> m<sup>a</sup>*. It would be simplest of errors to pass from the *d<sup>a</sup>ra<sup>a</sup>* of *draugā* to that of *daršam*. Possibly we should rather write as our corrected text *h<sup>a</sup>c<sup>a</sup>a / d<sup>a</sup>ra<sup>a</sup>(ug<sup>a</sup>a / d<sup>a</sup>ra<sup>a</sup>)š<sup>a</sup>m<sup>a</sup>*.

§ 45. In carefully cut inscriptions, as we have said, it is just such mechanical errors as this that will occur, if any at all are present. Two excellent examples of haplography occur in the bronze tablet containing the Treaty between the Naupactians and the Hypothenemidian Locrians:<sup>2</sup> at the end of line 11, ΑΠΟΝΤΙΟΝ stands for ἀπ’ Ὀ(πὼ)ντίων, and in line 22, ΝΑΥΠΑΚΤΙΣ stands for Ναυπάκτι(ὁς)τις. In our OPers. inscriptions, three examples of the converse fault, dittography, may be cited: Bh. 1, 23 *t<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>n<sup>a</sup>a* for *t<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>a = tyā*, by the influence of the immediately following *m<sup>a</sup>n<sup>a</sup>a = manā*<sup>3</sup>; Bh. 4, 44 [*up<sup>a</sup>av<sup>a</sup>*]*r<sup>a</sup>t<sup>a</sup>i<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>i<sup>a</sup>* for [*up<sup>a</sup>av<sup>a</sup>*]*r<sup>a</sup>t<sup>a</sup>i<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>* = [*upāva*]*rtaiy<sup>a</sup>*<sup>4</sup>; Dar. Sus. b 8 [*ah<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>a*]*y<sup>a</sup>ay<sup>a</sup>* for [*ah<sup>a</sup>y<sup>a</sup>a*]*y<sup>a</sup>a* = [*ahyā*]*yā*.

§ 46. Haplology, the spoken analogue of haplography, is a frequent phenomenon in Avestan,<sup>5</sup> and is found in at least three

<sup>1</sup> Foy, *KZ.* 35, 31—32, does indeed read *daršam* in Bh. 1, 50, but goes astray in his interpretation of *hacā*.

<sup>2</sup> Buck, *Greek Dialects.* 215f.; *Insc. Graecae* IX, 1, 334.

<sup>3</sup> Benfey, *Pers. Keilinschr.* 9; Tolman, *Lex.* 94.

<sup>4</sup> Tolman, *Lex.* 26.

<sup>5</sup> Reichelt, *Awest. Elementarbuch*, § 164; Brugmann, *Gdr. d. vgl. Gr.* I<sup>2</sup>, § 984.

OPers. words: *hamātā*, = \**hama-mātā* (Bh. 1, 30), cf. *hama-pitā*; *arštām* = \**aršta-tām* (Bh. 4, 64), cf. Av. *aršta* 'upright'<sup>1</sup>; *dīdīy* = \**dīdīdiy* (Dar. NRa 41)<sup>2</sup>; perhaps also in *duvarθim* (Xerx. Pers. a 12), = \**duvar-varθim*.<sup>3</sup>

## V. Ušabārim, Bh. 1, 86—87.

§ 47. Bh. 1, 86—87:

*pasāva adam kāram maškāuvā avākanam aniyam uša- 86*  
*bārim akunavam aniyahyā asam frānayam 87*

Darius is describing his passage of the Tigris in the campaign against Nadintabaira: "afterwards I transported the army on floats of skins; one part I made camel-borne, for the other I brought horses".

§ 48. The word *ušabārim* was long a stumbling block, but the establishing of the reading as *uša-* has rid us of a numerous crop of emendations of the text<sup>4</sup>; and the true meaning was recognized long ago by Oppert<sup>5</sup>, who interpreted the word as 'borne by camels', by a comparison with the Elamitic version. The problem remaining is, how may we reconcile OPers. *uša-* 'camel', with Av. *uštra-* 'camel'?

§ 49. Bartholomae<sup>6</sup> thinks that two signs, *tar<sup>a</sup>*, failed to be cut on the stone, possibly because at the turn of the line the engraver missed them, and reads *uš[tra]bārim*. Jackson<sup>7</sup> has suggested a connection with Skt. *ukṣan-*, Av. *uxšan-*, giving a meaning 'borne by oxen', which is inherently improbable. Weissbach<sup>8</sup>, supporting the meaning 'camel-borne', thinks it a by-form for *uštra-*, or an error for it.

§ 50. For comparison, the two forms of the word for 'horse', IE. \**ekwo-*, Skt. *açva-*, Av. *aspa*, may be drawn upon. In the OPers. inscriptions we find both *aspa-* and *asa-*:

<sup>1</sup> Brugmann, *l. c.*; and perhaps in the loc. sing. of stems in long *i*, cf. § 5 fn.; but not in *asabāri-*, which is to be read thus and not as *asbari-* for \**aspabāri-*, cf. § 50.

<sup>2</sup> Bartholomae, *AiW.* 725.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* 766; not haplography, as Tolman, *Lex.* 102, cites him.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Tolman. *Lex.* 78—79.

<sup>5</sup> *ZDMG.* 10, 804.

<sup>6</sup> *AiW.* 421.

<sup>7</sup> Tolman, *Lex.* 78.

<sup>8</sup> *ZDMG.* 61, 725; cf. also Hüsing, *KZ.* 38, 259.



*aspa-* in *Aspa-canah-*, *uv-aspa-* *Vištāspa-*,  
*asa* in *asa-*, *asa-bāri-*, perhaps in *Asa-garta-* *Asagartiya-*.<sup>1</sup>

This double development of IE. *ky* in Iranian is now a recognized phenomenon<sup>2</sup>, as for example also in *vispa-* *visa-* = Skt. *viçva-*, and the OPers. personal name *Ašpabāra* (in an Assyrian transcription)<sup>3</sup> compared with *asabāribiš*, Bh. 2, 2. 71; 3, 41. 72, cf. Dar. NRb 44. 45.

§ 51. The suggestion is therefore made that the doublet *asa-aspa-* 'horse' had an influence upon the words *\*uša-*<sup>4</sup> 'ox' and *uštra-* 'camel', in such a way that *uša-* came to be felt as a by-form of *uštra-*, standing in the same relation to it as *asa-* does to *aspa-*; the meaning 'ox' was lost, being taken up by other available familiar words, and the meaning 'camel' was acquired, which it has in the passage of the Behistan inscription.

## VI. Šim, Bh. 4, 6.

§ 52. Bh. 4, 2—8:

	<i>θātiy D-</i>	2
<i>ārayavauš xš[āyathi]ya ima tya adam akuna-</i>		3
<i>vam vašnā Aura[mazd]āha hamahyāyā θar-</i>		4
<i>da pasāva yaθā x[šayathiya] abavam XIX hamaran-</i>		5
<i>ā akunavam vašn[ā Aura]mazdāha adamšim a-</i>		6
<i>janam utā IX xš[āyathiya]ā agarbāyām I Gaumāta</i>		7
<i>nāma maguš āha [hauv ad]urujiya avabā abaha . . .</i>		8

Darius is summarizing the suppression of the rebellions: "Says Darius the king: This (is) what I did; by the grace of Ahuramazda, in one-and-the-same year after that I became king, I fought nineteen battles; by the grace of Ahuramazda I smote *him* and took captive nine kings. One was a Magian, Gaumāta by name; he lied; thus he said . . ."

§ 53. The difficulty lies in the *šim* of line 6. Apparently its only possible antecedent is the *hamaranā*, which is a neuter plural. The text is assured, so that there is no longer room for

<sup>1</sup> For another etymology, see Bartholomae, *AiW.* 207.

<sup>2</sup> Gray, *AJP.* 21, 6 ff.; Bartholomae, *AiW.* 1457, s. v. *visa-*.

<sup>3</sup> Bartholomae, *Zum AiW.* 121, who still reads *asbāri-* despite this.

<sup>4</sup> The Skt. *ukšan-* and the Av. *ušan-* are *-n*-stems, and it is even possible that this proportional working upon the meaning, *aspa* 'horse': *asa-* 'horse' = *uštra-* 'camel': *ušan-* 'ox', changed the stem-class as well.

emending to a gen. plur. *šām*<sup>1</sup> or to an acc. plur. *šiš*<sup>2</sup>. Tolman<sup>3</sup> keeps *šim* and translates "I waged them and seized nine kings", making the pronoun refer to the battles. Weissbach<sup>4</sup> emends to *šiš* and regards the pronoun as referring to the enemies of Darius, = "meine Widersacher". King-Thompson keep the *šim* and cut the Gordian knot by omitting the troublesome pronoun entirely: "I overthrew nine kings and made (them) captive".

§ 54. Accepting *šim* as the correct reading, we may proceed to seek its antecédent. And here various peculiarities of OPers. use of pronouns must be taken into account. The enclitics especially are instructive:

- § 55. *šim*: acc. sing., masc. ordinarily, but fem. Dar. NRa 36. In Bh. 1, 62, it is probably neuter, with *xšaθram* as antecedent, but possibly fem., referring to *taumāyā*.<sup>5</sup> But in Bh. 1, 96, it refers to *aniya*,<sup>6</sup> a logical

<sup>1</sup> So Weissbach-Bang II. Bartholomae, *AiW.* 1726, accepts this and considers it a gen.-dat. replacing the acc., though this construction does not occur elsewhere in OPers. On [*š*]ām, Bh. 5, 15, see § 56 fn.

<sup>2</sup> So Weissbach, *Keilinschr. d. Achäm.* He quotes a private communication from King-Thompson, that the sign for *ma* is not perfectly sure. But the signs *mā* and *ša* are so unlike that traces read *mā* could hardly be an indistinct *ša*.

<sup>3</sup> *Lex.* 25.

<sup>4</sup> *Keilinschr. d. Achäm.* 57 fn.

<sup>5</sup> Foy, *KZ.* 35, 73—74, thinks it a neuter like the Av. *hīm* and *dim*, by extension from the masc. since in *o*-stem nouns the acc. masc. and the acc. neut. have the same termination; he adduces the same phenomenon in the carelessly written inscriptions of Artaxerxes, where *imam* has replaced *ima* as neuter, Art. Sus. a 3, Ham. 5. 7. For the other view, cf. Bartholomae, *Grundriss d. iran. Phil.* I, p. 239, § 421, n. 5.

*Iyam* is properly fem. sing. nom., not masc.; cf. Skt. *ayam* masc., *iyam* fem., Av. *aēm* (< *ayam*) masc., *īm* (< *iyam*) fem. *Iyam* in OPers. is fem. only Dar. Pers. d 6 and Sz. c 10, and is masc. in Bh. b 1, c 1, d 1, e 1, f 1, g 1, h 1, i 1, j 1, k 1, and in Dar. NR I, II, III, IV, XVII. The old nom. masc. \**ayam* was remade to *iyam* under the influence of the initial of the masc. acc. *imam* and of the fem. nom. *iyam*. Then from the likeness of the two nominatives, *imam* became a fem. acc., as in Art. Pers. a 22 = b 29, *imam ustašanām*; this development was assisted doubtless by the fact that the enclitic acc. *dim* and *šim* were alike in the two genders. Then, Art. Sus. c 4—5 has even [*i*]mām *hadiš*, though *hadiš* is neuter, taking *ima* in Xerx. Pers. ca 10—11 = cb 18, da 16 = db 24, Sus. 2.

<sup>6</sup> I take *aniya* here not in the sense of 'the enemy', but of 'the rest', referring back to *kāram*; Bh. 1, 94—96:

plural, though a singular in form. If *utāš[im]* be the correct restoration in Bh. 5, 26—27, it likewise refers to *aniyam*, 25, or to a word referring to *aniyam*, now lost in the gap in 26; but *aniyam* itself is a partial appositive to *Sak[ā]*, 25, if that be the correct restoration,<sup>1</sup> and is therefore a logical plural, so that *-š[im]*, 27, has a logically plural antecedent, as at Bh. 1, 96.

- § 56. *šām*: gen.(-dat.) plur., masc. or fem.; antecedents:  
*kāra*-, sing. in form, but logically plural, Bh. 2, 20.  
 83; 3, 31. 57. 85; 5, 8 [here restored merely].

Darius' army, or the armies of both sides, probably the latter: 2, 27. 37. 42. 47. 56. 62. 98; 3, 8. 19. 40. 47. 64. 69.

the commander and his army, 2, 20. 83; 3, 57. 85.  
*Uvajiyā*, masc. plur., 2, 13; 5, 12. 15<sup>2</sup> [these two are restorations merely].

*dahyāva*, fem. plur., 1, 14. 19. 23; Dar. NRa 18, 20.

In Dar. NRa 36—7 *-šām* has as antecedent the idea of *dahyāva* implied in *būmim*, 32.<sup>3</sup>

- § 57. *dīš*: acc. plur., masc. and fem.; antecedents:

---

	[ <i>vašnā Aura</i> ]ma-	94
<i>zdāha kāram tyam Nadintabairahyā adam ajanam vasiy aniya āpi[y]a</i>		
	[ <i>ahyat</i> ]ā ā-	95
<i>pišim parābara</i>		96

“By the grace of Ahuramazda the army of Nadintabaira I smote mightily; the rest was driven into the water; the water bore *it* away”.

It is quite unnecessary to assume the meaning ‘enemy’ for *aniya*- in OPers., for in the phrase *hacā anīyanā*, Dar. Pers. d 11, e 20—21, the meaning is merely ‘the other fellow’, that is, any possible rival to the king; cf. *alter* in Horace’s (*Sat.* 1, 1, 40) *cum . . . nil obstat tibi, dum ne sit te ditior alter*.

<sup>1</sup> Or should 25 be restored [*kāram tyam*] *Saka[m av]ājanam*, instead of \* \* \* \* *Sak[ā av]ājanam*, as it appears in Tolman, *Lex.*?

<sup>2</sup> Bh. 5, 15—16:

<i>a[dakaīy Uvaj]iyā [atarsan] utā[š]ām Aurama-</i>	15
<i>zdā [manā dastayā] a[kunauš]</i>	16

is too largely restored to form a real point d’appui for an emendation to *-šām* in Bh. 4, 6, as an object (cf. Bartholomae, *AiW.* 1726), despite the parallel idiom at Bh. 4, 35 *pasāva di[š Auramaz]dā manā dastayā akunauš* ‘afterwards Ahuramazda delivered them into my hand’, for in 5, 15, the *-šām* may be a partitive genitive as object, cf. Xen. *Anab.* 1, 5, 7 λαβόντας τοῦ βαρβαρικοῦ στρατοῦ, 4, 5, 35 τῶν πύλων λαμβάνει.

<sup>3</sup> *Dahyāva* is indeed found at the end of line 39.

*Uvajiyā*, masc. plur., Bh. 5, 17.

*Sakā* (or some equivalent word), masc. plur., Bh. 5, 33.

*kāra-*, masc. sing., collective, Bh. 1, 65.

*imam dipim* (fem. sing.) *imaivā patikārā* (masc. plur.), Bh. 4, 73. 74. 77. 78.

*dahyāva*, fem. plur., Dar. NRa 21<sup>1</sup>; Bh. 4, 34. 35. 36.

§ 58. The last passage deserves examination: Bh. 4, 33—36:

<i>θātiy Dārayava[vaus xšā]yaθiya dahyāva imā tyā hamīriy-</i>	33
<i>ā abavan drauga di[s hamīriy]ā akunaus tyā imaiy kām adur-</i>	34
<i>ujiyašan pasāva di[s Auramaz]dā manā dastayā akunaus yaθā mām k-</i>	35
<i>āma avaθā di[s akunavam]</i> <sup>2</sup>	36

“Says Darius the king: These (are) the provinces which became rebellious; the Lie made them hostile, so that those men deceived the people; afterwards Ahuramazda delivered them into my hand; as (was) my pleasure, so I did unto them.”

The first *diš* refers quite clearly to *dahyāva*, and the second and third refer either to the same or to *imaiy* and *kām* 34, like the *diš* of Bh. 1, 65. The antecedent of *imaiy* 34 is the *IX xšāyaθiyā* of 32, listed separately in 7—31.

§ 59. *avaiy*, Bh. 4, 69, is an acc. plur. masc.<sup>3</sup> with alternative sing. masc. antecedents, which are not exclusive the one of the other.

The text is, Bh. 4, 67—69:

<i>θātiy Dārayavaus xšāyaθiya tuvam [kā] xšāyaθiya</i>	67
<i>hya uparam āhy martiya [hya] draujana ahatiyy hyavā [zū]rakara **</i>	
	<i>ahat-</i> 68
<i>iy avaiy mā dauštā [bīy]ā ufraštādiy parsā</i>	69

<sup>1</sup> *diš* is here an acc., despite the apparent passive in the verb if we read *dātam tyā manā avadi[s] adāriy*; for *adāriy* differs from *adaršiy*, Dar. Pers. e 8, only in being a strong aorist instead of a sigmatic aorist. Dar. Pers. e 8, *imā dahyāva tyā adam adaršiy*, means ‘These are the provinces which I have brought into my possession’; Dar. NRa 21—22 means ‘The law which (is) mine, that brought them under its sway’. But *adāriy*, Bh. 2, 75. 90, is a true passive; the active form *adāraya* is transitive Bh. 1, 85 and Dar. NRa 41, but intransitive Bh. 2, 9 and 3, 23; the middle *ha[ma]dārayai[y]*, Bh. 1, 26, is transitive.

<sup>2</sup> Only in this passage is *diš* orthotone; *daiy*, Bh. 5, 11, nom. plur. as acc., also is orthotone. But no other form of the stems *da-* *di-* *ša-* *ši-* appears except as an enclitic.

<sup>3</sup> This translation is provisionally kept here; but cf. §§ 64—69.

"Says Darius the king: Thou who shalt be king hereafter, the man who shall be a deceiver or who shall be a wrongdoer, these do thou not befriend, punish (them) with severe punishment."<sup>1</sup>

That *avaiy* is really an acc. plur. is shown by the idiom in Bh. 4, 55—56 and 74—75, *Auramazdā θuvām dauštā bīyā*, where *θuvām* is an unmistakable acc. The idiom of a direct object governed by a transitive phrase consisting of a verbal noun and the copula, is found in many languages, cf. Plaut. *Cas.* 406, *Quid tibi istunc tactiost*?<sup>2</sup>

§ 60. Of all this, the part which is of importance for our *-šim* Bh. 4, 6, is the following:

1. *sim* is a singular, not a plural, and may be of any gender, though the neuter is unlikely, and the feminine is not of frequent occurrence in the OPers. inscriptions because of the nature of the subject matter.
2. The pronoun with a collective singular antecedent may be in the singular (*šim*, Bh. 1, 96; 5, 26—27); or in the plural (*šām*, Bh. 2, 20. 83; 3, 31. 57. 85; 5, 8; *dīš*, Bh. 1, 65).
3. The pronoun with alternative singular antecedents may be in the plural (*avaiy*, Bh. 4, 69).
4. The antecedent may be suggested by another noun in the context, but not itself expressed, as at Dar. NRa 36—37, where *šām* represents a *dahyāva* implied from *būmim*.

§ 61. This last phenomenon may be paralleled in other literatures. For example, in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Act I, Scene 2, verses 68—73, the Queen says to Hamlet,

<sup>1</sup> See preceding ftn.

<sup>2</sup> The other pronouns do not offer peculiarities with reference to their antecedents, but two deserve mention because of their interesting forms.

Dar. NR XV and XXIX have *iyama* = *iyam*, with plural predicate nominative. But *iyama* is merely miswritten for *imoiya* = *imaiy*, because in I, II, III, IV, [XVI], XVIII the formula is in the singular. All these are the inscriptions above the national types of the empire.

Bh. 4, 90 has [*niyap*] *išam iya* [*d*] *ipi* \* \* \*, and 89 has *i* [*ya*] *dipi* \* \* \* . . . if in the latter place King-Thompson are right in saying that the vacant space after the *i* has room for one character rather than for two. May this *iya* not really be \**i*, the original form of the nom. sing. fem. (Brugmann, *Gdr. d. vgl. Gram.* II<sup>2</sup>, 2, § 349, p. 355), properly to be written *īy*? This form may have been to a certain extent proclitic like the Greek *ὀ ἦ*.

Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted color off, 68  
 And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.  
 Do not for ever with thy veiled lids 70  
 Seek for thy noble father in the dust.  
 Thou know'st 'tis common; all that lives must die,  
 Passing through nature to eternity. 73

In 72, 't has no expressed antecedent, though it refers manifestly to 'death', an idea drawn from the preceding two lines.

Again, in the same play, Act IV, Scene 6, near the end, in Hamlet's letter to Horatio, we read: "Ere we were two days old at sea, a pirate of very warlike appointment gave us chase. Finding ourselves too slow of sail, we put on a compelled valour; in the grapple I boarded *them*: on the instant *they* got clear of our ship; so I alone became *their* prisoner". The italicized *them*, *they*, *their*, look back to an antecedent *pirates*, which is not to be found, but is suggested by the word *pirate*, used in the meaning of the ship and not of the men on board the ship.<sup>1</sup>

§ 62. Since, therefore, the *šim* of Bh. 4, 6, has no antecedent expressed, we must seek that antecedent in the ideas suggested by the lines preceding the pronoun. Our *šim* is object of *ajanam*; what kind of an object is *ajanam* likely to take?

Forms of *jan* take the following objects:

*kāram*, Bh. 1, 89. 95; 2, 21. 26. 31. 36. 41. 46. 51. 55. 61. 69. 84.  
 87. 98; 3, 7. 15. 18. 39. 46. 63. 68. 86.

Vivāna and the army of Darius, Bh. 3, 58.

*Bābiruvīyā*, Bh. 3, 88.

The phrase *jatā bīyā*, Bh. 4, 58. 78, governs a pronoun, *-taiy-tay*, denoting a person.

The passive participle *avajata*, Bh. 1, 32, has as its subject the name of a person.

---

<sup>1</sup> Caesar, *BC.* 1, 36, 1, uses *iis* to refer to the inhabitants of Massilia, implied from a preceding *Massiliam*. Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 942, uses *αὐτοῖς* to refer to a *πολιταί* inferred from a preceding *πόλιν*, and in *Phil.* 1364, has *οἱ γε* meaning those at Troy, implied from a preceding *Τροίαν*. Euripides, *Bac.* 959, uses *αὐτὸ τοῦτ'* with the idea of the preceding sentence as its antecedent; the single word which comes the nearest to being the antecedent is the plural *ἔρκεσιν*. For these pertinent passages I am indebted to my friend and former colleague, Dr. E. S. McCartney, now of the University of Texas.

The forms of *ava+ā+jan* govern the following:

The name of an individual person, or a pronoun denoting the same: Bh. 1, 31. 31. 57. 59. 73. 83; 2, 5. 13; 4, 81; 5, 13.

*kāram*, Bh. 1, 51. 52.

*martiyā tyaišaiy fratamā anušiṃyā* Bh. 3, 75.

The Susians, or a pronoun, Bh. 5, 11.

*Sak[ā]*, or [*kāram tyam*] *Saka[m]*, Bh. 5, 25.

*šim*, referring to the logical plural *aniyam*, Bh. 5, 27.

*Patī+jan*, Dar. NRa 47, takes a collective singular object, *partaram*, 'the foe'.

Thus of all these, every one has as its object a word denoting a person or a group of persons; there is no idiom in OPers. which gives to the root *jan* a non-living object, such as in Tolman's 'waged them' (= battles), in Bh. 4, 6 for *adamšim ajanam*.<sup>1</sup>

§ 63. So, in Bh. 4, 6—7, *adamšim ajanam*, the object of *ajanam* should be a person or persons, and is represented by the singular pronoun *šim*. The only word in the preceding context that can suggest this antecedent is the neuter plural *hamaranā* 'battles.' Manifestly this implied antecedent must be a singular, but with a collective meaning, so as to be a logical plural. Out of *hamaranā*, therefore, I extract a collective singular word meaning 'foe', to serve as antecedent of *šim*. What this word may have been, it is difficult to say; but we may suggest the frequent *kāra hamθriya*, or *partaram* (Dar. NRa 47, used collectively<sup>2</sup>), or even *aniyam* in its sense of 'rival' (Dar. Pers. d 11, e 20—21; see § 55 ftn.) With this interpretation, the difficulty about *šim* no longer remains, and we may render the passage, "Says Darius the king: This (is) what I did; by the grace of Ahuramazda, in one-and-the-same year after that I became king, I fought nineteen battles; by the grace of Ahuramazda I smote the foe and took-captive nine kings. One was . . ."

<sup>1</sup> *Fra+jan* 'to cut off (ears and nose and tongue)', Bh. 2, 74. 79, falls into a different semantic class in this point, while *jan* 'to smite', *ava+jan* and *ava+ā+jan* 'to smite down, to slay', and *patī+jan* 'to fight against', lie very close together.

<sup>2</sup> If only *hamaram* had not been supplanted in Dar. NRa 47 by the corrected reading *partaram*, it would have been the obvious word for the implied antecedent, because of its etymological relation with *hamaranā*.

VII. Ufraštādiy, Bh. 4, 69.

§ 64. Bh. 4, 67—69:

<i>oātiy Dārayavauš xšāyapiya tuvam [kā] xšāyapiya</i>	67
<i>hya aparam āhy martiya [hya] draujana ahatiy hyavā [zū]rakara ** ahat-</i>	68
<i>iy avaiy mā dauštā [bīy]ā ufraštādiy parsā</i>	69

“Says Darius the king: Thou who shalt be king hereafter, the man who shall be a deceiver or who shall be a wrong-doer, these do thou not befriend<sup>1</sup>; punish (them) *with severe punishment*”.

§ 65. The *ufraštādiy*, commonly translated ‘with severe punishment’, is interpreted as a loc. sing. to the fem. abstract substantive *ufrašti-*, plus the postposition *adiy*, = Skt. *adhi*.<sup>2</sup> Neither the substantive nor the preposition occurs again in the OPers. inscriptions, and a simpler explanation is here proposed.

§ 66. There are three other occurrences of the verb *fras-* ‘punish’,<sup>3</sup> accompanied in every instance with the compound of the participle with *u-* (Skt. *su-*, Av. *hu-*) ‘well’. They are as follows:

Bh. 1, 22 *hya araika āha avam ufrastam aparsam* ‘who was hostile, him I punished well(-punished)’.

Bh. 4, 38 *mart[iya hya drau]jana ahatiy avam ufraštam parsā* ‘the man who shall be a deceiver, punish him well(-punished)’.

Bh. 4, 66—67 *hya viyanā[sa]ya avam ufrastam aparsam* ‘who injured (my house), him I punished well(-punished)’.

§ 67. We have every time, the object *avam*, the predicate adjective *ufraštam*<sup>4</sup>, and the verb *fras-* in the indicative or imperative as the main verb of the sentence. But in Bh. 4, 69 we find the object *avaiy* in the plural, and should expect the predicate adjective to be in the plural. This would be *ufraštā*,

<sup>1</sup> On the syntax, see § 59.

<sup>2</sup> The reading *ufraštādiy* is assured by King-Thompson. For the interpretations, see Bartholomae, *IF*. 12, 110, and Tolman, *Lex*. 76.

<sup>3</sup> *Pati+fras-*, found Bh. 4, 42. 48, is too different in meaning to give any assistance for Bh. 4, 69.

<sup>4</sup> The variation between *s* and *š* is readily explainable as the result of leveling. The root *prek-* will regularly become Iranian *fras-*, *prk-ske-* becomes Iran. *parsa*, *prk-to-* (Skt. *prṣṭa-*) becomes Iran. *\*paršta-*. Mixture of the various tense stems will easily give both *frašta-* and *frasta-*.



which we have!<sup>1</sup> The problem is with the *-diy* or *-adiy*, or *-ādiy*, enclitic to the *ufraštā*.

§ 68. A postposition *adiy* = Skt. *adhi*, is quite out of place. I propose that this is the emphatic particle *-diy*, = Av. *zī*, Skt. *hi*. Though this word does not occur elsewhere in OPers., it is no worse off in that respect than *adiy*, and the corresponding *zī* is common in Av., while the Av. representative of *adiy* is found in only one word, Gāthic *ādy-ū-*, later *ādy-ū-* 'helfend, nützlich, brauchbar, tüchtig zu — —'. Thus *diy* has better Iranian support than has *adiy*. Its use in Bh. 4, 69 agrees admirably with the definition of Av. *zī* given by Bartholomae,<sup>2</sup> 'enkl. Part., hinter dem ersten Wort des Satzes; 3) *zī* steht in Sätzen, die b) eine Aufforderung enthalten'.

§ 69. Our passage therefore means, "these do thou not befriend; verily punish them well(-punished)".<sup>3</sup> Herewith *ufrašti-* and *adiy* are removed from the OPers. vocabulary, and the enclitic *diy* claims a place.

<sup>1</sup> *Ufraštā* and *ufraštām* are in precisely the same relation to each other as *θakatā* and *θakatām*; curiously, the former of these was, precisely like *ufraštā*, long taken to be the loc. of an *-i*-stem, and, again like *ufraštā*, found its true place by a comparison with the singular form.

<sup>2</sup> *AIW*. 1693, 1695.

<sup>3</sup> Weissbach, *Keilinschr. d. Achām.*, translates "bestrafe (sie) streng", though he gives no grammatical interpretation of the form. At 4, 38, he translates "den bestrafe streng", which in combination with the other suggests that he may have had nearly the view presented above.